



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,499	01/24/2005	Pierre Floriano	LABN:023US	7143
57457	7590	08/07/2009	EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI LLP			BEISNER, WILLIAM H	
600 CONGRESS AVENUE				
SUITE 2400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78701			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/522,499	FLORIANO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILLIAM H. BEISNER	1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 50-54, 83, 84, 86-91 and 95-99 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 50-54, 83, 84, 86-91 and 95-99 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/22/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 50-54, 83, 84, 86-91 and 95-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Independent claim 50 was amended in the response filed 5/22/2009. When amending the claims, Applicants point to the originally filed claims and pages 44-48 of the instant specification.

With respect to amended independent claim 50 and all dependent claims, the limitation "contacting the lymphocytes collected on the membrane with a visualization agent" is considered new matter. As shown on pages 44-48 of the instant specification, all discussion involving the

detection of lymphocytes involves contacting the sample including lymphocytes with a visualization agent prior to collection on the membrane.

Additionally, claims 51, 53, 83, 87-89, 95 and 96 are not considered to have support in the originally filed specification and claims. Amended claim 50 is drawn to a specific embodiment involving the detection of lymphocytes (CD4) which is discussed on pages 44-48 of the instant specification. The combination of the additional steps recited in claims 51, 53, 83, 87-89, 95 and 96 with the detection of lymphocytes is disclosed in the originally filed disclosure. Specifically, the detailed discussion involving the detection of lymphocytes is devoid of the use of three different wavelengths of light and/or the use of binary masks.

As a result, the instantly claimed invention was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skill in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 54 and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 54 and 84, “the images” lacks antecedent basis. Note claim 50 only recites the use of one image.

Art Unit: 1797

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 50, 54, 83, 84, 86, 90, 91 and 97-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Law et al.(US 6,709,868) in view of Straus (US 2003/0170613).

With respect to claim 50, the reference of Law et al. discloses a method of analyzing a fluid sample that includes passing one milliliter or less of a fluid sample (Example 1) through a

Art Unit: 1797

membrane-based flow sensor assembly (Figure 1) including a membrane wherein the fluid sample comprises lymphocytes that are at least partially retained by the membrane; contacting the lymphocytes with a visualization agent (Example 1; column 7, lines 39-60); and analyzing the collected lymphocytes on the membrane (Example 1).

Claim 50 differs by reciting that the analyzing step involves imaging of the lymphocytes on the membrane.

The reference of Straus discloses a method of labeling and concentrating a sample including lymphocytes the analyzes the collected sample using imaging (Example 30)

In view of this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to employ imaging analysis in the method of the primary reference for the known and expected result of employing an alternative means recognized in the art to achieve the same result.

With respect to claim 54, the images are collected using a digital detection device (Figure 3 of Straus).

With respect to claim 83, subtracting background information from the detected image is well within the purview of one having ordinary skill in the art for the known and expected result of reducing the noise within the detection system. Also, cleaning the surface of the membrane would have been obvious for the known and expected result of allowing the device to be used for additional assays.

With respect to claim 84, the images are collected using a detector and programmable controller (paragraph [0258] of Straus).

With respect to claim 86, the visualization agent includes a label configured to emit light at a specific wavelength spectrum (Example 30 of Straus).

With respect to claim 90, the images are collected using a CCD detector (Figure 3 of Straus).

With respect to claim 91, based merely on considerations such as the size of the membrane to be analyzed, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a magnified (microscope) image.

With respect to claim 97, the fluid sample is a blood sample (Example 1 of Law et al.).

With respect to claim 98, the label is a fluorescent label (Example 30 of Straus).

With respect to claim 99, the visualization agent is an anti-CD4 antibody (column 7, lines 39-60 of Law et al. and Example 30 of Straus).

10. Claims 51-53, 87-89, 95 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Law et al.(US 6,709,868) in view of Straus (US 2003/0170613) taken further in view of Miller et al.(US 3,827,804).

The combination of the references of Law et al. and Straus has been discussed above.

Claims 51-53, 87-89, 95 and 96 differ by reciting that red, blue and green components of light are detected using a white light source.

The reference of Miller et al. discloses that it is known in the art to employ red, blue and green light components when detecting lymphocytes (See Figure 5 and column 1, lines 20-42).

In view of the disclosure of Miller et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ red, blue and green light components when detecting lymphocytes in

Art Unit: 1797

the sample for the known and expected result of optically filtering out other components of the fluid sample.

With respect to the specifics of the masks employed to generate the final image, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine the optimal image mask configuration based merely on the specifics of the visualization agents employed and/or the potential source of interfering matter contained within the fluid sample while maintaining the detection efficiency of the assay.

Double Patenting

11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

12. Claims 50, 90 and 99 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 6 and 12 of copending

Application No. 10/544,864. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1, 3, 6 and 12 of copending application ‘864 claim substantially the same method as required of claims 50, 90 and 99 of the instant application. The instant claims differ by reciting that the sample is one milliliter or less. However, if not implicit in the claims, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine the optimal volume of sample to employ while maintaining the efficiency of the detection method.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

13. Claims 50-54, 83, 84, 86-91 and 95-99 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3-12 of copending Application No. 11/746,956. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1 and 3-12 of copending application ‘956 claim substantially the same method as required of claims 50, 90 and 99 of the instant application. The instant claims differ by reciting that the sample is one milliliter or less. However, if not implicit in the claims, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine the optimal volume of sample to employ while maintaining the efficiency of the detection method.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

14. Claims 50-54, 83, 84, 86-91 and 95-99 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21-25 and 27-29 of copending Application No. 11/022,365. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 21-25 and 27-29 of copending Application No. 11/022,365 claim substantially the same method as required of claims 50, 90 and 99 of the instant application. The instant claims differ by reciting that the sample is one milliliter or less. However, if not implicit in the claims, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine the optimal volume of sample to employ while maintaining the efficiency of the detection method.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

15. With respect to the rejection of Claims 50-54, 69, 81 and 83-94 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raspe (NL 1007489) (as evidenced by Van Run (WO 93/23154) and the English language translation of NL 1007489) in view of Hyldig-Nielsen (US 2002/0090626), this rejection has been withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims and related comments filed on pages 6-7 of the response filed 5/22/2009. However, new grounds of rejection have been made over the combination of the references of Law et al.(US 6,709,868) in view of Straus (US 2003/0170613).

16. With respect to the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 50-54, 69 and 81-94 over copending U.S. application 11/022,365, this rejection has been maintained since a terminal disclaimer has not been filed.

Conclusion

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM H. BEISNER whose telephone number is (571)272-1269. The examiner can normally be reached on Tues. to Fri. and alt. Mon. from 6:15am to 3:45pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**/William H. Beisner/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1797**

Application/Control Number: 10/522,499
Art Unit: 1797

Page 11

WHB